

SECRET

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel  
Thursday - 11 May 1972

Page 3

25X1 10. [ ] Spoke with Charles Ablard and Eugene Kopp, USIA, concerning their additions to our proposed draft floor statement on section 205 (dissemination of information) of S. 3526, and suggested several changes which Ablard accepted. USIA is interpreting section 205 as not requiring attribution on material disseminated by a foreign party.

Mr. Ablard said that Senator Howard Baker (R., Tenn.) has been lined up as a possible spokesman for the Administration's position on section 205 and that Ablard will be seeking an appointment with Senator Baker for Mr. Maury and himself. In response to my question, Ablard said that Korologos, Deputy Assistant to the President, is apparently no longer involved and that Marshall Wright, of State, is calling the shots.

In response to my question, Mr. Kopp said that Senator Henry Bellmon's (R., Okla.) amendments to section 504, Personnel Reductions, was prompted by his interest in the Department of Agriculture, and agreed that similar moves on behalf of other agencies would probably lead to the deletion of section 504.

25X1 N. [ ] Delivered to Representatives Floyd Spence (R., S.C.) and C. W. Bill Young (R., Fla.) copies of selected items from [ ] concerning use of quotes of statements by prominent Americans to illustrate American public support for North Vietnam policies. Any use made of these items will be made without attribution to the Agency. Both offices requested that they be placed on subscription [ ] has been advised. STATSPEC

25X1 12. [ ] Met with Mr. Ralph Preston, House Appropriations Committee staff, and confirmed with him the meeting for Monday, 15 April, at 10:00 a.m. with Mr. Duckett, DDS&T, as a followon to the budget briefing provided at Headquarters on Friday, 5 May 1972. Mr. Preston told me that the Director's meeting with the special group for briefing on the community budget for 1 June is now as firm as it can be. It is Mr. Preston's opinion that the Chairman is so pressed for time that he probably will not be calling a special group briefing on Vietnam unless something major occurs to necessitate a meeting with the Director.

I briefed Mr. Preston on the following items: Chinese surface naval force equipment; Soviet SA-3 missiles in Iraq, G-class submarine in Cuban waters, and satellite communications; and the current situation in Vietnam.

SECRET

Jack -  
This could be used  
to either strike or sub-  
stitute.

Baker = Tim Korolov

CA

*substitute*  
Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment to ~~strike~~ a section of the bill S. 3526 which I believe is unwise and goes far beyond either the intent or the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee. It is a provision which would prevent the United States Government from providing any assistance to foreign governments in the field of information. It applies to all government agencies, prohibiting any of them from directly or indirectly preparing or assisting in preparing for dissemination, or disseminating, information of any kind for, on behalf of, or in the name of a foreign government.

The committee was apparently concerned about the activities of the U. S. Information Agency in southeast Asia. These activities were begun during previous administrations. USIA assisted the information services of the governments of the Indochinese States and Thailand. But the Agency has testified that they have discontinued this effort and that present USIA policy is that such activities should be the responsibility of the governments concerned. To the extent that the bill is directed against USIA operations in southeast Asia, it addresses a situation which no longer exists.

However, it will have an adverse impact on other agencies and activities which promote American *domestic and foreign* interests and which should be continued. *^*  
Since World War II our government has provided information assistance

-2-

to foreign governments as a constructive and relatively inexpensive part of foreign policy. In addition, of course, it has served our own <sup>domestic</sup> foreign ~~policy~~ interests when other governments were in a position to communicate to their people matters about which our government was concerned, or which were matters of international policy, such as the current efforts on narcotics control and ecology.

In post war Europe we provided advice and, in some cases, media materials to governments which received Marshall Plan aid and which supported our foreign policy objectives. Following the Marshall Plan period, the U. S. on occasion responded to requests of a small number of developing nations for assistance with their own information program. This assistance was carefully tailored to provide support for our overall foreign policy goals and was designed to encourage a stable and peaceful political evolution. It was provided only for limited periods of time and for limited objectives.

The sweeping language of section 205 would either prohibit or seriously impair the further dissemination of information which is now routinely passed between federal agencies and foreign public and private agencies to serve mutual interests in such fields as welfare, commerce and security. In reaching well beyond the intent of the original Informational and Cultural Exchange Act, section 205 would prohibit or impair the

-3-

further dissemination of information dealing with the following areas of concern to our government, both domestically and as they relate to foreign policy:

a. Narcotics

Section 205 would prohibit dissemination of information to foreign public agencies for further dissemination of information concerning detection, controls, seizures and prosecutions which have a direct impact on our domestic drug problem. Foreign narcotics control activities such as the preparation of training materials based on US-supplied information for use in police anti-drug divisions, would be seriously hampered. Further, Federal agencies would be prohibited from disseminating information received from a foreign country for the purpose of apprehending or extraditing for that foreign country a fugitive drug pusher who has sought refuge in the United States. It would seem that such a prohibition would also be contrary to treaty obligations.

b. Family Planning

Section 205 would also prohibit the dissemination of information to foreign public agencies and impair the use of information by foreign private agencies concerning methods to achieve planned population growth and advanced methods of curtailing uncontrolled birth rates.

-4-

c. Police Matters

Section 205 would prohibit the dissemination of information to foreign police agencies for further dissemination concerning international crimes and criminals, extradition matters, and law enforcement techniques. Such prohibition would also appear to be an abrogation of U. S. treaty responsibilities.

d. Ecology

Section 205 would prohibit the dissemination of information to foreign public agencies for further dissemination concerning violations of environmental protective agreements, management of natural resources development, and techniques to help minimize or redress ecological damage.

e. Education, Including Peace Corps Contributions

Section 205 would prohibit the dissemination of information to foreign public agencies for further dissemination and impair the dissemination of information to foreign private agencies which are designed to improve the effectiveness of educational systems.

f. Health

Section 205 would prohibit the dissemination of information to foreign public agencies for further dissemination concerning international health problems, epidemics and other indigenous health

-5-

problems in foreign countries, and the overall use and development of medicines and techniques in improving the health of populations.

g. Commerce

Section 205 would prohibit the United States Travel Service from providing information to foreign public agencies and impair its effectiveness with foreign private agencies for the further dissemination of information, materials, texts, and photos designed to encourage travel to the United States.

There are many other illustrations falling into such areas as disarmament goals, atomic energy, military aid, insurgency, agricultural affairs, international money matters, and international law, which could also be affected by this provision.

I doubt very much that the sweeping language used in section 205 would have been favorably reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had the points I have touched upon been covered in hearings before that committee when this legislation was being considered. I am unaware of the depth of the committee's hearings on this matter.

Clearly, section 205 goes beyond the scope of S. 3526, which I understand to be an authorization measure for the Department of State, USIA, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Peace Corps. Moreover, the ramifications of section 205, as I have illustrated, are

-6-

- clearly outside the purview of the Information and Educational Exchange Act.

In addition to the above, this bill would have one other undesirable result. The second section requires attribution by the particular government agency of any product it disseminates overseas. ~~It requires that~~ <sup>\* (add)</sup> *HP The requirement that* the attribution be placed at the beginning of the material.

~~I am advised by a number of government agencies that this~~ would seriously diminish the effectiveness of materials which this government might want to have distributed abroad and would require new printing of those which we do attribute, either by a specific government agency or the U. S. Government in general, either at the beginning or the end of the document. The bill would apply to all material distributed, including copies of historical documents, political science tracts, information about law enforcement, international police work, ecology, health and population control, and travel service promotion. These are things which obviously the U. S. Government has no interest in hiding, but whether the specific attribution may be printed in the right place or say exactly the right thing and can be accomplished within the time established in this bill, which would be the time of passage, is difficult to ascertain and it could result in unnecessary and unwarranted expense to the Treasury.

In one special respect this provision could have a most undesirable

*\* I have already indicated how this requirement could impair the effectiveness of our Government's cooperation with foreign private agencies on matters concerning health and welfare.*

Approved For Release 2007/02/07 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000600120020-7



Ablard could not buy this suggestion since,  
if provision passes, USIA wants room to  
interpret that it does not require  
attribution.

effect on USIA's operation

who want to come to the

The Agency lends its support

facilitates travel, information

Many of these products are valuable in correcting distortions

in the United States which are so prevalent abroad. As evidence of the

distortions and a description of some of the work USIA is doing to correct

them, I request permission to insert in the Record the series by

Mr. Merrill Panitt, editor of TV Guide, which recently appeared in

that publication. Mr. Panitt's analysis is startling, but that his report

is all too true is confirmed by any of us who have had an opportunity to

see how our nation is represented on television screens in other countries.

I think we would all agree, indeed foreign visitors to the United States

do agree, that the best remedy for some of the false impressions people

overseas have about our country is to expose more of the broad reality

of life here to television viewers abroad. That is what USIA, with its

programs of facilitative assistance to foreign television producers, is

trying to do. The problem posed by this bill, however, arises from the

fact that ~~most~~ <sup>if the</sup> ~~instances~~ foreign television networks <sup>carrying the program is</sup> ~~are~~ government-

owned and government-operated. <sup>such assistance would be prohibited,</sup> ~~If the bill passes with this restrictive~~

<sup>If the network is privately owned, the program</sup> ~~provision, a question could be raised whether USIA would be able to~~

<sup>apparently must be branded as a U.S. Government</sup> ~~product even though USIA's assistance may be~~

<sup>relatively insignificant. Such requirement -- if enforceable</sup> ~~with producers would deter the very type of facilitative~~  
<sup>assured which that a U.S. Government</sup> ~~assured which that a U.S. Government~~

America to foreign audiences.

-8-

- ~~continue~~ to give the foreign government television networks the help that they request from the Agency.

The amendment I have proposed to section 205 I believe is consistent with the legislative activities of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and properly confines the informational restrictions of the section to those carried out under the authority of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948.